

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,209	03/24/2004	Satoshi Hiranuma	SANA:007	3920
7590 11/16/2005 .			EXAMINER	
ROSSI & ASSOCIATES			TRAN, DIEM T	
P.O. Box 826 Ashburn, VA 20146-0826			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			ARTONII	PAPER NUMBER
			3748	
			D	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/808,209	HIRANUMA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Diem Tran	3748
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinuity will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 and 8-13 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 5-7 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Burear * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. Is have been received in Applicat Inity documents have been receiv In (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	

Art Unit: 3748

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara (JP 07-034858) in view of Hepburn et al. (US Patent 6,813,882).

Regarding claims 1, 10-13, Uehara discloses an exhaust gas purifying system comprising: a filter disposed in said exhaust passage to collect a particulate matter contained in the exhaust gas; a regeneration start determining means for determining a regeneration start of said filter (see page 5, paragraphs [0032,0033]); a regenerator means for regenerating said filter; an oxygen mass flow rate detecting means for detecting or calculating a mass flow rate oxygen fed to said filter; and a regeneration end determining means for determining a regeneration end of said filter in accordance with information provided from said oxygen mass flow rate detecting means and upon arrival of an integrated value of said oxygen mass flow rate at a predetermined value during regeneration of said filter by said regenerator means (see translation, page 3, paragraph [0016], page 6); however, fails to disclose that an oxidation catalyst is disposed upstream of the filter. Hepburn teaches that it is conventional in the art, to utilize an oxidation catalyst (26) being disposed upstream of the filter (19) in the exhaust system (see Figure 1).

Art Unit: 3748

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have utilized the teaching of Hepburn in the Uehara system, since the use thereof would have improved the emission control system.

Regarding claim 2, Uehara further discloses a temperature detecting means for detecting the temperature of the filter, and wherein said regeneration end determining means determines a regeneration end of said filter in accordance with information provided from said temperature detecting means and said oxygen mass flow rate detecting means and upon arrival at a predetermined value of an integrated value of said oxygen mass flow rate from the time when the temperature of said filter has reached a predetermined temperature (see translation, page 7).

Regarding claim 3, the modified Uehara system discloses all the claimed limitations as discussed in claim 1 above, however, fails to disclose determining a regeneration end of the filter based on the integrated value of a oxygen flow rate using the claimed equation.

One having ordinary skills in the art, would have found such equations to be obvious since they appear to represent a standard means to determine an amount of soot combusted in the filter. If Applicant has any evidence as to the novelness of the above equations he should submit such in response to this office action.

Regarding claim 4, the modified Uehara system discloses all the claimed limitations as discussed in claim 1 above, however, fails to disclose calculating the oxygen mass flow rate based on a mass flow rate of intake air using the claimed equation.

One having ordinary skills in the art, would have found such equations to be obvious since they appear to represent standard means to determine an oxygen mass flow rate. If

Applicant has any evidence as to the novelness of the above equations he should submit such in

Art Unit: 3748

response to this office action.

Regarding claim 8, Hepburn further teaches that a temperature is disposed downstream of said catalyst and input from said sensor is used as the filter temperature (see Figure 1, col. 4, lines 26-28).

Regarding claim 9, the modified Uehara system discloses all the claimed limitations as discussed in claim 2 above, however, fails to disclose calculating the filter temperature based on the temperature output from sensors upstream and downstream of the filter using claimed equation.

One having ordinary skills in the art, would have found such equations to be obvious since they appear to represent standard means to determine an accurate value of the filter temperature since a distribution of temperature is not the same along an axial direction of the filter. If Applicant has any evidence as to the novelness of the above equations he should submit such in response to this office action.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Diem Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4866. The examiner

Art Unit: 3748

can normally be reached on Monday -Friday from 8:00 a.m.- 6:00p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas E. Denion, can be reached on (571) 272-4859. The fax number for this group is (571)273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 800-786-9199 (toll-free).

Diem Tran

Patent Examiner

Art unit 3748

DT

November 14, 2005

THOMAS DENION

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700